arXiv:1609.07539v1 [nlin.AO] 24 Sep 2016

Almost Everywhere Stability of Discrete-Time Dynamical Systems

Özkan Karabacak, Rafael Wisniewski and John-Josef Leth

September 27, 2016

Abstract

It is known that the existence of a Lyapunov-type density function, called Lyapunov densities or Lyapunov measures, implies the convergence of Lebesgue almost all solutions to an equilibrium. Considering the evolution of densities using Perron-Frobenius operator, the Lyapunov density approach can be formulated clearly. In this paper, we consider discrete-time dynamical systems and prove a a Lyapunov density theorem with less assumption than the ones that exist in the current literature.

1 Introduction

Lyapunov density has been proposed by Rantzer [1] and shown to guarantee convergence of almost all solutions to an equilibrium. This approach has been proved to be useful in control theory, in particular in feedback stabilization [2] In [3], Lyapunov density (called also Lyapunov measure) has been considered in view of Markov processes. In this paper, we improve Theorem 16 in [3] by removing two necessary condition, namely the compactness of the state space and the local almost everywhere stability assumption of the invariant set.

By a measure μ on X, we always mean a σ-finite measure defined on the Borel σ-algebra of X. We say that a property is satisfied μ almost everywhere of μ.a.e. in short, if the set of points (initial conditions for solutions) that do not satisfy the property has μ-measure zero. For any set $V \subset X$, we denote the ε-neighborhood of V by $B_\varepsilon(V)$, or sometimes just by B_ε if the set V is clear from the context. For $0 \in X$, notation $B_\varepsilon = B_\varepsilon(\{0\})$ will be used for ε-neighborhood of the point set $\{0\}$. For a set $A \subset X$, $A^c := X - A$ denotes the complement of A.

2 Main Results

Consider a discrete-time dynamical system on a metric space X given by

$$x(k+1) = T(x(k)) \quad x(0) \in X. \tag{1}$$

Let m be a (σ-finite) measure defined on $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}(X)$, i.e. the σ-algebra of Borel subsets of X. We assume that the dynamics T is nonsingular, namely $A \in \mathcal{B}$ and $m(A) = 0$ implies that $m(T^{-1}A) = 0$. A pair of measure μ_1 and μ_2 are said to be equivalent if they give rise to the same set of zero measures, i.e. if for any $A \in \mathcal{B}$, $\mu_1(A) = 0 \iff \mu_2(A) = 0$. A measure μ is said to be properly subinvariant if $\mu(T^{-1}A) < \mu(A)$ whenever $\mu(A) > 0$.

Theorem 1 (Lyapunov measure) *Let $0 \in X$ be an equilibrium of (1). Assume that there exists a properly subinvariant measure μ that is equivalent to m and finite on B_ε^c for any $\varepsilon > 0$. Then, solutions of (1) converge to 0 m.a.e. .*

3 Preliminary Definitions and Tools

A measure μ_2 is said to be weaker than another measure μ_1 if $\mu_1(A) = 0 \implies \mu_2(A) = 0$. In this case, we write $\mu_2 \ll \mu_1$. Clearly, μ_1 and μ_2 are equivalent if and only if $\mu_1 \ll \mu_2$ and $\mu_2 \ll \mu_1$. Radon-Nikodym theorem states that if μ and m are signed measures with $\mu \ll m$ then there exists a measurable function defined on X such that

$$\mu(A) = \int_A \rho \, dm. \tag{2}$$

ρ is called Radon-Nikodym derivative of μ with respect to m. If μ is a positive measure equivalent to a positive measure m then ρ must be strictly positive (m.a.e.). The Radon-Nikodym derivative of a measure is unique up to a set of m-measure zero. On the other hand, if m is a positive measure and $\rho \geq 0$ (*resp.* $\rho > 0$) is an m-measurable function on X, then $\mu(A) := \int_A \rho \, dm$ defines a measure weaker than (*resp.* equivalent to) m. Therefore, there is a one-to-one correspondence between the set of positive measures (*resp.* signed measures) that are weaker than m and the set of equivalence classes of nonnegative measurable functions (*resp.* all measurable functions), where equivalence classes are defined as sets of functions that differs only on m-measure zero points.

3.1 Perron-Frobenious Operator

Let $\mathcal{M}$ denote the linear vector space of signed measures on X. The evolution of distributions under the dynamics of (1) can be captured by a linear operator $\mathbb{P} : \mathcal{M} \to \mathcal{M}$ defined as

$$(\mathbb{P}\mu)(A) := \mu(T^{-1}A). \tag{3}$$

Assume that μ is weaker than m. Since T is nonsingular $m(A) = 0 \implies m(T^{-1}A) = 0 \implies \mu(T^{-1}A) = 0 \implies (\mathbb{P}\mu)(A) = 0$. Then $\mathbb{P}\mu$ is also weaker than m. Therefore, $\mathbb{P}$ maps weaker (than m) measures to weaker (than m) measures. Equivalently, $\mathbb{P}$ can be seen to act over the space of measurable functions (Radon-Nikodym derivatives of measures). In other words, $\mathbb{P}\rho$ is defined as the Radon-Nikodym derivative of $\mathbb{P}\mu$ with respect

to m. Therefore,

$$\int_A \mathbb{P}\rho dm = \int_{T^{-1}A} \rho dm.^1 \tag{4}$$

$\mathbb{P}$ maps integrable functions to integrable functions. Therefore, the restriction of $\mathbb{P}$ as $\mathbb{P} : \mathcal{L}_1 \to \mathcal{L}_1$ is a Markov operator:

- $\rho \geq 0 \implies \mathbb{P}\rho \geq 0$
- $\|\mathbb{P}\rho\| \leq \|\rho\|$.

3.2 Koopman Operator

A dual method to capture the statistical behaviour of the deterministic system (1) is via the Koopman operator $\mathbb{U}$, which describes the evolution of the values of observables under the dynamics of (1). Let $\mathcal{O} = \mathcal{O}(X)$ denote the set of v equivalence classes of measurable functions on X. Define $\mathbb{U} : \mathcal{O} \to \mathcal{O}$ as

$$(\mathbb{U}f)(x) := f(Tx). \tag{5}$$

Clearly, $\mathbb{U}$ is linear and maps positive functions to positive functions. It also maps bounded functions to bounded functions. Hence $\mathbb{U}$ can be restricted to $\mathcal{L}_\infty$, the normed vector space of equivalence classes of bounded measurable functions.

3.3 Duality between Perron-Frobenious and Koopman Operators

If $\rho \in \mathcal{L}_1$ and $f \in \mathcal{L}_\infty$, then

$$< \rho, f >:= \int \rho f \ dm \tag{6}$$

is finite. To see the duality between $\mathbb{P} : \mathcal{L}_1 \to \mathcal{L}_1$ and $\mathbb{U} : \mathcal{L}_\infty \to \mathcal{L}_\infty$, observe that $< \mathbb{P}\rho, 1_A >= \int \mathbb{P}\rho 1_A \ dm = \int_A \mathbb{P}\rho \ dm = \int_{T^{-1}A} \rho \ dm = \int \rho 1_{T^{-1}A} \ dm =< \rho, 1_{T^{-1}A} >=< \rho, \mathbb{U}1_A >$. Since any function in $\mathcal{L}_\infty$ can be approximated by characteristic functions we have the following duality

$$< \mathbb{P}\rho, f >=< \rho, \mathbb{U}f > \quad \rho \in \mathcal{L}_1, \ f \in \mathcal{L}_\infty. \tag{7}$$

This duality persists even for general measurable functions whenever the integral is finite.

4 Proofs

We will use the following characterization for almost sure attractivity of the equilibrium:

Lemma 1 $\lim_{n\to\infty} x(n) = 0$ *m-a.e. if and only if the series* $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{U}^k 1_{B_\varepsilon^c}$ *is finite m-a.e. for all* $\varepsilon > 0$.

[1] We allow here the integral to be infinite.

Proof. Consider a trajectory $x(n)$ with initial condition $x_0 \in X$. Then, $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{U}^k 1_{B_\varepsilon^c}(x_0) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} 1_{B_\varepsilon^c}(T^n x_0)$ is equal to the number of visits of the trajectory $x(n)$ to the closed set B_ε^c. Hence, it is finite if and only if the set of limit points of $x(n)$ is nonempty and contained in B_ε. Therefore, $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{U}^k 1_{B_\varepsilon^c}(x_0)$ is finite m-a.e. if and only if the set of limit points of $x(n)$ is nonempty and contained in B_ε for m-a.e. initial points x_0. Invoking this statement for a sequence $\varepsilon_i \to 0$ and considering the fact that $\cap_i B_{\varepsilon_i} = \{0\}$ and that any intersection of countably many full measure sets is a full measure set give the result. ■

Proof of Theorem 1. We assume that there exists a properly subinvariant equivalent measure μ that is finite on B_ε^c for every $\varepsilon > 0$. Let $\rho > 0$ be the Radon-Nikodym derivative of μ with respect to m. Then, m-a.e. $\mathbb{P}\rho < \rho$. Define $\rho_0 := \rho - \mathbb{P}\rho$. Clearly ρ_0 is positive m-a.e..

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\rho}_0 &:= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}^k \rho_0 \\ &= \rho_0 + \mathbb{P}\rho_0 + \mathbb{P}^2\rho_0 + \cdots \\ &= \rho - \mathbb{P}\rho + \mathbb{P}\rho - \mathbb{P}^2\rho + \mathbb{P}^2\rho - \mathbb{P}^3\rho + \cdots \\ &= \rho - \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{P}^n \rho. \end{aligned}$$

The last limit exists m.a.e. since $\mathbb{P}^n\rho$ is a decreasing sequence bounded from below. Since ρ and therefore all $\mathbb{P}^n\rho$ has finite integral on sets B_ε^c, we conclude that $\bar{\rho}_0$ has finite integral on sets B_ε^c. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{finite} &= < \bar{\rho}_0, 1_{B_\varepsilon^c} > \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} < \mathbb{P}^k \rho_0, 1_{B_\varepsilon^c} > \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} < \rho_0, \mathbb{U}^k 1_{B_\varepsilon^c} > \\ &= < \rho_0, \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{U}^k 1_{B_\varepsilon^c} > \end{aligned}$$

Since ρ_0 is positive m-a.e., $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{U}^k 1_{B_\varepsilon^c}$ is finite m-a.e. and from Lemma 1, 0 is attracting m-a.e.. ■

References

[1] Anders Rantzer. A dual to Lyapunov's stability theorem. *Systems and Control Letters*, 42:1–17, 2001.

[2] Stephen Prajna, Pablo a. Parrilo, and a. Rantzer. Nonlinear control synthesis by convex optimization. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 49(2):310–314, 2004.

[3] Umesh Vaidya and Prashant G. Mehta. Lyapunov measure for almost everywhere stability. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 53(1):307–323, 2008.